







UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignina 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/281,852	03/31/1999	DARYL CARVIS CROMER	RP9-99-048	7708
	7590 05/12/2003			
BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, L.L.P.			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 969			LEE, CHI CHUNG	
AUSTIN,, TX	78767-0969		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2131	
			DATE MAILED: 05/12/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

` <u> </u>			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	Q.
Advisory Action	09/281,852	CROMER ET AL.	
, and a second	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chi-Chung E Lee	2131	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence ado	Iress
THE REPLY FILED 25 April 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this applic 1) a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper repl th places the applica	y to a ation in
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mail b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF T	ng date of the final rejecti HE FINAL REJECTION.	ion. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	of extension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for reply fice later than three months after the ma	ount of the fee. The apportunity of the final originally set in the final	ropriate extension Office action; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 			
The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered t	pecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or sin	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of t	inally rejected claim	S.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	d be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: S		idered but does NO	T place the
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were	e newly
 For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w 			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	s a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapp	roved by the Exami	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449)		
0. Other:	M	0 11	
		M Ags	
		HAYES	
		PATENT EXAMINER Y CENTER 2100	





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As per applicant arguments on page 3 related to the reason or motivation for combining the teachings of Paltenghe, Pond and Schneier, the examiner asserts that the prior art as a whole must suggest the desirability to modify the primary reference. In this case, Pond suggests a motivation for encrypting the important file in the hard drive to provide a high level of protection even if the data storage medium (i.e. hard disk) is physically stolen, (see office action page 4 lines 1-3 and Pond column 5 lines 1-3). As the cookie is an obvious important information in the Paltenghe et al, it would have been obvious to encrypt it in the hard disk. 2. As per applicant argument on page 3 related to encrypt/decrypt cookie using key pairs, Pond does mention the file is protected from unauthorized access by encrypting/decrypting the file using mamdatory key stream desigated by the key mix, (see Pond column 6 lines 35-63).